UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,036	01/08/2004	Stanley Bielak	10032	7885

7590   09/03/2008

STANLEY BEILAK
2128 BAYFRONT AVENUE TERRACE
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21409

EXAMINER
HONG, HYUN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6, 8-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 8-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 7 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Computer programs are non-statutory subject-

matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 16-17, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Owens (US 6,315,572)

further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US

2003/0110215).

    Regarding claim 1, Huggins discloses a method for creating a presentation

Adding placeholder slides (fig. 10),

    Uploading the presentation into the remote server which is accessible to end-

users ([0023]),

    However Huggins does not disclose slides corresponding to user polls,quizzes,

or website links accessible via a remote server.

    In analogous art, Owens discloses user quizzes (fig. 12).

    It would have been obvious to combine the user quizzes of Owens into the

presentation of Huggins in order. This would improve the presentation by making it

more interactive for the user.

    Huggins in view of Owens also does not disclose taking a video stream including

a plurality of video frames, each said video frame including a time stamp; and

sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on said display device, starting from

an initial video frame of said video stream.

    In analogous art, Roelens discloses taking a video stream including a plurality of

video frames, each said video frame including a time stamp; and sequentially displaying

said video frame by frame on said display device, starting from an initial video frame of

said video stream ([0008,0009]).

It would have been obvious to combine the video frame display of Roelens into the presentation of Huggins in view of Owens. This ensures that the video and audio of the presentation are synchronized.

However, Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens does not disclose recording information regarding an end-user's usage of a presentation, said information including how far the end-user watched said presentation.

In analogous art, Joao discloses recording information regarding an end-user's usage of a presentation, said information including how far the end-user watched said presentation ([0036,0041]).

It would have been obvious to combine the monitoring of Joao into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens. This would allow an author to monitor the progress of the presentation's viewers.

Regarding claim 2, Huggins in view of Owens in view of Roelens in view of Joao discloses a method for playing a presentation including polls or quizzes comprising:

Receiving a presentation from a remote server ([0024] of Huggins)

Sequentially playing the frames, starting from an initial frame of the stream of data ([0008, 0009] of Roelens),

Selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to a poll or quiz to be accessed by the end user (col. 9 lines 27-34, fig. 8 of Owens).

Monitoring usage of said presentation ([0036, 0041] of Joao);

Recording information regarding each end-user's usage of said presentation, the information including how far the end-user watched said presentation and how much time the end-user spent watching said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 6, Huggins in view of Owens in view of Roelens in view of Joao discloses The method of displaying a presentation according to claim 2, wherein the polls or quiz results are stored for later analysis (col. 5 lines 62-63 of Owens).

Regarding claim 16, see claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, see claim 2.

Regarding claim 19, Huggins in view of Owens in view of Roelens in view of Joao discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the information further includes which end-user watched which particular presentation, and how much time the end-user spent watching the particular presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 20, Huggins in view of Owens in view of Roelens in view of Joao discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the information further includes information regarding when an end-user exits said presentation ([0036,0041] of Joao).

Claims 3, 8-14, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coughlin (US 2003/0034999) in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Owens (US 6,315,572) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215).

Regarding claim 3, Coughlin discloses a method of communicating between a presentation program; said program being stored on a computer readable medium

executable by computer, and a remote server including interactive media when said

presentation is being viewed by a user, said method comprising:

Communicating a request for poll or quiz to the remote server ([0092]);

Receiving a stream of data from the server, including poll or quiz information

([0092]);

Responding to the poll or quiz at a local by an end user ([0093] and

uploading the poll or quiz results to the remote server ([0093] *Sends response to*

a web server).

Placeholder slides corresponding to user polls, quizzes or website links

accessible via a remote server (fig. 17),

However, Coughlin does not specifically disclose wherein said presentation

includes video stream including a plurality of video frames, each said video frame

including a time stamp; sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on a display

device, starting from an initial video frame of said video stream;

In analogous art, Roelens discloses wherein said presentation includes video

stream including a plurality of video frames, each said video frame including a time

stamp; sequentially displaying said video frame by frame on a display device, starting

from an initial video frame of said video stream ([0008, 0009]);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the video frame display of

Roelens into the presentation of Coughlin. This ensures that the video and audio of the

presentation are synchronized.

However, Coughlin in view of Roelens does not specifically disclose wherein said end user selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to a poll or quiz to be accessed by the end user.

In analogous art, Owens discloses wherein said end user selecting from a table of contents being displayed on a display device of a local computer, content related to a poll or quiz to be accessed by the end user (col. 9 lines 27-34, fig. 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the table of contents of Owens into the presentation system of Coughlin in view of Roelens. This allows the user to easily select a presentation from a list of presentations.

However, Coughlin in view of Roelens in view of Owens does not disclose monitoring usage of a presentation; recording information regarding each user's usage of said presentation, wherein said information includes information regarding when said user exits a presentation.

In analogous art, Joao discloses monitoring usage of a presentation; recording information regarding each user's usage of said presentation, wherein said information includes information regarding when said user exits a presentation ([0036, 0041]).

It would have been obvious to combine the monitoring of Joao into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens. This would allow an author to monitor the progress of the presentation's viewers.

Regarding claim 8, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens in view of Joao discloses The method according to claim 3, wherein said information include information regarding which user watched which particular presentation and how far the

user watched said presentation and how much time said user spent watching said presentation ([0031] of Coughlin, [0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 9, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens in view of Joao discloses The method according to claim 3, wherein said information is reported and/or displayed to a user and/or presentation owner ([0030] of Coughlin, [0036,0041] of Joao).

Regarding claim 10, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens in view of Joao discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said polls or quiz results are stored for later analysis (col. 5 lines 62-63 of Owens).

Regarding claim 11, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens in view of Joao discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation indexing a video and slides to allow a user to jump to different portions of the presentation (col. 9 lines 27-34, fig. 8 of Owens).

Regarding claim 12, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens in view of Joao discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation is paused for a poll or quiz when the poll or quiz is initiated by said user or required by said presentation ([0092] of Coughlin).

Regarding claim 13, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens in view of Joao discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein said presentation program synchronizes a video with active server pages references that point to specific polls or quizzes ([0092] of Coughlin).

Regarding claim 14, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens in view of Joao discloses the method according to claim 3, wherein an end user accesses said presentation by providing a valid authorization key (fig. 15 of Coughlin).

Regarding claim 18, see claim 3.

Claims 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Owens (US 6,315,572) further in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215). as applied to claim 1 above, further in Coughlin (US 2003/0034999).

Regarding claim 4, Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens further in view of Joao discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising collecting indexing and other data from a server database and displaying said indexing and other data to a presentation's author creating indexes for users to look up presentations based on content (col. 9 lines 27-34, fig. 8 of Owens).

However, Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens in view of Joao does not disclose log-on that validates authors.

In analogous art, Coughlin discloses log-on that validates authors (fig. 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the validation of Coughlin into the presentation system of Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens in view of Joao. This would prevent any unauthorized editing of a presentation.

Claims 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Huggins (US 2004/0225743) in view of Owens (US 6,315,572) further in view of

Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) as applied to

claim 1 above, further in view of Mills (US 2004/0010470).

Regarding claim 5, Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens further

in view of Joao discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein said presentation is

hosted by said remote server, and said remote server hosting presentations user

tracking and monitoring (col. 5 lines 60-67 of Owens) indexing for users to look up

select presentations (col. 9 lines 27-34, fig. 8 of Owens).

However, Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens in view of Joao

does not disclose encrypting presentation content and deploying licenses for viewing

protected content.

In analogous art, Mills discloses Encrypting presentation content and deploying

licenses for viewing protected content ([0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the encryption of Mills into the

presentation system of Huggins in view of Owens further in view of Roelens in view of

Joao. This would prevent any unauthorized access of the presentations.

Claims 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Coughlin (US 2003/0034999) in view of Roelens (US 2005/0021811) further in view of

Owens (US 6,315,572) further in view of Joao (US 2003/0110215) as applied to claim

14 above, further in view of Mills (US 2004/0010470).

Regarding claim 15, Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens

further in view of Joao discloses the method according to claim 14 and presentation

program shutdown (fig. 41 "X" of Coughlin). However, Coughlin in view of Roelens

further in view of Owens further in view of Joao does not disclose presentation program

shutdown if the user attempts to access an encrypted presentation without an

authorized key.

In analogous art, Mills discloses presentation program shutdown if the user

attempts to access an encrypted presentation without an authorized key ([0034] of

Mills).

It would have been obvious to combine the encrypted presentation of Mills into

the presentation system of Coughlin in view of Roelens further in view of Owens further

in view of Joao. This would prevent unauthorized use of the presentation program.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hyun J. Hong whose telephone number is (571)270-

1553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30a-7:00p).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571)272-7304. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. J. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2623

/Vivek Srivastava/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623